

**TEXAS HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD**

**Summary Notes/Minutes**

**Radio and Television Field of Study Advisory Committee Meeting**

**1200 East Anderson Lane, Board Room**

**Austin, Texas**

**August 9, 2018, 1:00 PM – 5:00 PM**

**August 10, 2018, 8:30 AM – 12:00 PM**

*The webcasts of these meetings are available at the following links:*

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EDIdxUz8yPk>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FLSeUrX3Rjw>

**August 9, 2018, 1:00 PM – 5:00 PM**

**1. Call to order and introductions**

Allen Michie called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM.

The following committee members were present:

Stephen Ames, Houston Community College  
Derek Blackwell, Prairie View A&M University  
Nancy Boyens, McLennan Community College  
Todd Chambers, Texas Tech University  
Andrew Clark, The University of Texas at Arlington  
Erica Edwards, Richland College  
Andrea Fuentes, South Texas College  
Kathryn Kelly, Blinn College  
Raymond Niekamp, Texas State University  
Christian Raymond, Austin Community College  
Geron Scates, Western Texas College

The following committee members were absent:

Danny Malone, Tarleton State University  
Michael McFarland, West Texas A&M University

Coordinating Board Staff present:

Allen Michie, Program Director

**2. Consideration of appointing a recording secretary**

Ray Niekamp volunteered to serve as recording secretary and was elected by acclamation.

**3. Consideration of election of Co-Chairs**

Christian Raymond (Austin Community College) was nominated to serve as co-chair from two-year institutions and was elected by acclamation. Andrew Clark (The University of Texas at Arlington) was nominated from four-year institutions and was elected by acclamation.

Members were randomly assigned one-, two-, or three-year term limits. Co-chairs receive two-year terms ending August 31, 2020.

#### **4. Public testimony**

No one from the public was present to testify.

#### **5. Break for consultation between Coordinating Board staff and Co-Chairs**

The committee recessed for 15 minutes.

#### **6. Overview of Field of Study rules and mission – Dr. Allen Michie**

Michie provided an overview of the Fields of Study (FOS) statute, how it is part of a wider range of transfer success initiatives, and how it contributes to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's 60x30TX strategic plan.

Michie stated the goals of the meeting:

- Review curricula from programs at representative two- and four-year institutions
- Review approved courses in the *Academic Course Guide Manual* (ACGM)
- Decide which lower division courses are necessary for success in upper division courses in a major
- Adjust course objectives and descriptions as necessary
- Balance student freedom with institution priorities
- Create a guaranteed pathway to the degree and minimize the number of excess hours that students take

Michie answered questions about FOS and the approval process.

#### **7. Discussion and consideration of Radio & Television Field of Study curriculum**

Discussion of the scope of exactly what Radio & Television (RTV) is and what these programs cover. The degree programs have different names at different institutions, even though RTV is the name assigned to the Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code. Fuentes pointed out that the varying names of programs and courses sometimes cause problems with transfer.

Blackwell offered that technology and production are the unique characteristics of RTV programs, as opposed to Communications and Journalism. Raymond added technique and media literacy, and Edwards added the basics of good writing and editing.

There was a consensus that Advertising is a different course sequence that needs a separate FOS.

Raymond and Clark suggested that the committee work down the list of *Lower-Division Academic Course Guide Manual* (ACGM) courses with a focus on technique, technology, and skills classes.

*Discussion of Introduction to Mass Communication (COMM 1307):*

Edwards stated that COMM 1307 provides an overview of other Mass Communication courses, and it counts toward the core curriculum.

A discussion followed on the differences between Introduction to Mass Communication and Introduction to Electronic Media (COMM 1335). Members also discussed various existing courses that could be used as equivalents for COMM 1307 in transfer, including courses that address media literacy.

There was a consensus that COMM 1307 belongs in the FOS.

*Discussion of Video Production I (COMM 1336):*

Raymond said that this should be a 3000-level course, but it could transfer in as elective credit. He asked if the course could include photography skills. Chambers and Clark replied that some photography needs to be covered in a video production class.

Niekamp mentioned that some of the ACGM courses may be too specialized for accreditation purposes.

Edwards proposed that the course description be expanded to include shot production, including shooting on cell phones or whatever else students are given in the field. Raymond agreed that students should get their hands on a camera in the first two years.

Edwards made a motion to have a Learning Objectives Committee adjust the description of COMM 1336 to include field production rather than just studio production with this recommended wording: "Practical experience in a variety of production environments, including pre- and post-production needs." Kelly proposed changing outcomes 3, 5, and 7 to eliminate the word "studio" and make it more all-encompassing. The word "studio" should remain in learning objective 8. The motion passed.

*Discussion of Video Production II (COMM 1337):*

The consensus was the course is too specific for the FOS.

*Discussion of Media Literacy (COMM 2300):*

Edwards argued that media literacy can be built into COMM 1307, but that everyone should take both COMM 1307 and COMM 2300. Raymond said that the average adult spends 10 hours a day on media, and it is important for all students to have media literacy.

Michie pointed out that COMM 2300 is currently offered at no universities, but Chambers made

the correction that it is sometimes offered under a different name or it may be offered at the upper division.

Kelly said that if COMM 2300 is not included in the FOS, there is an argument for including more media literacy in COMM 1307. Clark added that media literacy is more of a Communications class than an RTV class.

## **8. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned for the day at 5:00.

### **August 10, 2018, 8:30 AM – 12:00 PM**

## **1. Discussion and consideration of Radio & Television Field of Study curriculum**

### *Discussion of Audio Production (COMM 2303):*

Scates and Clark said that Audio Production is an essential course. Ames added that students come in with visual skills but have an uphill battle with listening skills, and it is important for students to know audio engineering in order to be hire good engineers, even if they do not end up doing audio themselves. Kelly made a motion to include COMM 2303 in the FOS, and it passed unanimously.

### *Discussion of Media Writing (COMM 2311) and Writing for Radio, Television, & Film (COMM 2339):*

Clark and Edwards said the course is important for writing in all kinds of media. Discussion followed about the broad approach of COMM 2311 vs. the narrower broadcasting focus of COMM 2339. Kelly made a motion to include both COMM 2311 and COMM 2339 as finalists for the FOS to revisit. The motion passed unanimously.

### *Discussion of Radio/Television Announcing (COMM 2331):*

Scates said that the course is essential for Radio & Television programs. Niekamp and Chambers said that there would be transferability issues with the course, as not all universities offer it. Blackwell felt that the course is too specialized and not all students want to do announcing. Michie pointed out that skills-based courses are not typically approved for the core curriculum, and Kelly said that skills courses should not be included in the FOS.

### *Discussion of Introduction to Advertising (COMM 2327):*

Kelly and Edwards said that the course has value to students, but the challenge is the limitation on the FOS credit hours.

### *Discussion of Introduction to Cinema (COMM 2366):*

The consensus was that the course does not belong in the FOS.

### *Discussion of Academic Cooperatives (COMM 2289 and 2389):*

Kelly, Clark, and others discussed how cooperatives are used at institutions for capstone courses. Discussion followed about how courses with variable content can cause problems with transfer.

Clark reviewed the non-COMM courses available in the ACGM. The committee discussed Design I (ARTS 1311), and Kelly, Raymond, and Boyens argued that is useful for Radio & Television students.

Committee members compared Introduction to Mass Media (COMM 1307) to Introduction to Electronic Media (COMM 1335). Edwards said that COMM 1335 is new media, and the course is sometimes offered online. Fuentes said that COMM 1307 includes traditional media, new media, and theories about the effects of media on society. Garcia said that a certain amount of course content is inevitably lost in transfer, and students will get similar skills if they take either course. Chambers said that COMM 1307 may be the broader base. Kelly and Edwards said that COMM 1307 contains more media history. Boyens made a motion to allow students a choice in taking either COMM 1307 or COMM 1335 in the FOS, and the motion carried.

*Discussion of Media Literacy (COMM 2300):*

Blackwell, Edwards, and others argued for the importance of media literacy in the curriculum and in society generally. Michie pointed out that the course is not currently required at any of the top 10 transfer-receiving universities and only seven colleges offer it, so while it may be necessary for students, it would likely transfer in as an elective. Kelly said that media literacy could be included in Introduction to Mass Communication, and Raymond countered that Media Literacy is a very different course.

Discussion followed about which writing course to include, Media Writing (COMM 2311) or Writing for Radio, Television, & Film (COMM 2339). Edwards made a motion to include an option in the FOS allowing students to choose either COMM 2311 or COMM 2339. The motion passed.

A motion was made and approved to propose the following FOS for public comment:

Course Title	Course Number	SCH
Choose one of the following survey courses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction to Mass Communication</li> <li>• Introduction to Electronic Media</li> </ul>	COMM 1307 COMM 1335	3
Choose one of the following writing courses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Media Writing</li> <li>• Writing for Radio, Television, and Film</li> </ul>	COMM 2311 COMM 2339	3
Video Production I	COMM 1336	3
Audio Production	COMM 2303	3
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>12</b>

## 8. Overview of the timeline for public comments and Field of Study approval

Michie stated that the proposed FOS would go out for a 30-day public comment period. Committee members would be given a copy of each comment for a response. If changes are made, the revised FOS would go out for a second 30-day comment period. The FOS curriculum

would go before the Coordinating Board's Committee on Academic and Workforce Success committee and the full Board for final approval.

**9. Consideration of authorization of Co-Chairs to approve minutes and final Field of Study documents**

A motion was made to authorize the co-chairs to approve the final meeting minutes and carry other related business for the FOS approval process before the Board. The motion passed.

**10. Adjournment**

A motion was made to adjourn and was passed by acclamation.